

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 3, and 5 are amended herein. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 3, and 5 may be found in the claims as filed originally. Reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0132070 to Redlich et al. ("hereinafter Redlich") in view of Bray and Thompson. The rejection is traversed to the extent it might apply to the claims as amended. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

The fourth clause of claim 1 recites:

Embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document.

Neither Redlich, Bray, nor Thompson teach, disclose, or suggest "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document," as recited in claim 1. The Office Action, in fact, does not even assert that either Redlich, Bray, or Thompson are "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document," as recited in claim 1.

In Redlich, to the contrary, the extracted data and the remainder or common data is stored in different, *distributed* memory segments, and a map is generated indicating the location of the extracted data and the remainder data in the network. In particular, as described in paragraph [0045]:

In one embodiment on a personal computer (PC) system, the extracted data and the remainder or common data is stored in different, distributed memory segments. In a network implementation, the extracted data may be stored in one computer and the remainder or common data may be stored in another computer. In a client-server implementation, the server may direct storage of the extracted data to a different location than the remainder data, either on the server or on a further memory system (computer) interconnected to the server or on the client

computer and in distributed memory segments. A map may be generated by a software module or sub-system indicating the location of the extracted data and the remainder data in the network.

Since, in Redlich, the extracted data and the remainder or common data is stored in different, distributed memory segments, and a map is generated indicating the location of the extracted data and the remainder data in the network, Redlich is not "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document," as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, in Redlich, the extractions are *dispersed* to distributed storage on a granular level, rather than "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described in paragraph [0059]:

In this configuration of the invention, the extractions are dispersed to distributed storage on a granular level. The rest of the document can be stored at its original location and/or other storage locations. Dispersal of extractions introduces new barriers not existing in current security. In certain situations, an attacker has first to find the (encrypted) map to the locations, then locate and access the distributed storage, get the data released from the controlled-release storage, and finally reintegrate the extracts into the appropriate documents.

Since, in Redlich, the extractions are dispersed to distributed storage on a granular level, Redlich is not "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document," as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, in Redlich, the computer or data input device handling source plaintext document 100 records the *location* of A-com 108 and B-ext 110, rather than "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described in paragraph [0168]:

In a further enhancement of the present invention, the computer or data input device handling source plaintext document 100 may also record the location of A-com 108 and B-ext 110. The location data is called herein a "map." A memory mapping function is utilized. The map may be stored in a third memory location 112. Memory location map 112 may be a segment of the memory of the data input computer originating plaintext 100. The map may be encrypted for security reasons.

Since, in Redlich, the computer or data input device handling source plaintext document 100 records the location of A-com 108 and B-ext 110, Redlich is not "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document," as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, in Redlich, the map 130 shows the *location* of memory segments in (a) the local computer; (b) the LAN or WAN; or (c) the Internet storage sites, rather than "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described in paragraph [0181]:

The location of the map and, hence, the location of the remainder data A-com 108 and extraction is provided to the user's computer in step 128. This may include obtaining a copy of the map 130 showing the location of memory segments in (a) the local computer; (b) the LAN or WAN; or (c) the Internet storage sites. The storage segments are A-com 108 and B-ext 110.

Since, in Redlich, the map 130 shows the location of memory segments in (a) the local computer; (b) the LAN or WAN; or (c) the Internet storage sites, Redlich is not "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document," as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, in Redlich, if the filter 102 is destroyed and all copies of the map are destroyed on the user's computer originating plaintext document data 100, and the map is stored *offsite* in a third computer memory location 112, this offsite map storage may enhance the degree of security of the data. In particular, as described further in paragraph [0181]:

Creation and storage of map in memory 112 also impacts the degree of security of the system. However, if the filter 102 is destroyed and all copies of the map are destroyed on the user's computer originating plaintext document data 100, and the map is stored offsite in a third computer memory location 112, this offsite map storage may enhance the degree of security of the data.

Since, in Redlich, if the filter 102 is destroyed and all copies of the map are destroyed on the user's computer originating plaintext document data 100, and the map is stored offsite in a third computer memory location 112, this offsite map storage may enhance the degree of security of the data, Redlich is not "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary

in said XML formatted document," as recited in claim 1.

Finally, in Redlich, the originating computer processing plaintext 100 is *scrubbed* to remove all reference and copies of the plaintext, remainder text, extracted data map storage data, etc., rather than "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described further in paragraph [0181]:

The originating computer processing plaintext 100 may be scrubbed to remove all reference and copies of the plaintext, remainder text, extracted data map storage data, etc., i.e., a deletion routine may be employed on the data input computer.

Since, in Redlich, the originating computer processing plaintext 100 is scrubbed to remove all reference and copies of the plaintext, remainder text, extracted data map storage data, etc., Redlich is not "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document," as recited in claim 1.

Neither Brady nor Thompson are "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document" either, and thus neither Brady nor Thompson can make up for the deficiencies of Redlich with respect to claim 1.

The sixth clause of claim 1 recites:

Replacing, in the original document, a character string which is contained in the non-disclosure dictionary and not contained in the compulsory disclosure dictionary, with a meaningless character string by using the tag of non-disclosure.

Neither Redlich, Bray, nor Thompson teach, disclose, or suggest "replacing, in the original document, a character string which is contained in the non-disclosure dictionary and not contained in the compulsory disclosure dictionary, with a meaningless character string by using the tag of non-disclosure," as recited in claim 1. Redlich, in fact, mentions no compulsory disclosure dictionary at all. The only dictionary in Redlich, rather, is used to separate words present in the dictionary from the source plaintext document 100 and place them into remainder document or common data file 104, or place words not found in the dictionary in an extracted text or extracted data file 106. In particular, as described at paragraph [0163]:

In a basic implementation, filter 102 may utilize a dictionary such that words present in the dictionary (common words) are separated from the source plaintext document 100 and placed into remainder document or common data file 104. The uncommon words (extracted-security sensitive words), not found in the dictionary, would be placed in an extracted text or extracted data file 106. For example, a business may wish to impose a security system on a contract document such that the names of the contracting parties (not found in the dictionary) and the street names (not found in the dictionary) would be stored in extracted data text file 106.

Since the only dictionary in Redlich is used to separate words present in the dictionary from the source plaintext document 100 and place them into remainder document or common data file 104, or place words not found in the dictionary in an extracted text or extracted data file 106, Redlich has no "compulsory disclosure dictionary," as recited in claim 1. Neither Brady nor Thompson have a compulsory disclosure dictionary either, and thus neither Brady nor Thompson can make up for the deficiencies of Redlich with respect to claim 1.

The Office Action acknowledges graciously in section 9, at page 5, that:

Redlich does not explicitly disclose the character string being replaced by a meaningless character string when a document is retrieved per se.

The Office Action attempts to compensate for this deficiency of Redlich by combining Redlich with Bray and Thompson, asserting in section 9, at page 5, with respect to Bray that:

However, Bray in at least page 3 discloses the structure of XML documents and the use of an XML processor to read XML data and in at least page 9 (last 3 lines) defines an XML document type declaration that provides a grammar for a class of documents. The grammar is known as a document type definition (DTD) that can point to an external subset containing markup declarations or can contain the markup declaration directly in an internal subset, or can do both (Bray, page 10).

Pointing to an external subset containing markup declarations or can contain the markup declaration directly in an internal subset, however, does not amount to replacing a character string by a meaningless character string when a document is retrieved, let alone "replacing, in the original document, a character string which is contained in the non-disclosure dictionary and not contained in the compulsory disclosure dictionary, with a meaningless character string by using the tag of non-disclosure," as recited in claim 1. Thus, even if Redlich, Bray, and Thompson were combined as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result.

Similarly, the Office Action asserts in section 9, at page 5, with respect to Thompson that:

Thompson in at least page 1 defines an XML Schema (extends the capabilities of DTDs) which offers facilities for describing the structure and constraining the contents of XML documents when they are retrieved or displayed.

Describing the structure and constraining the contents of XML documents when they are retrieved or displayed, however, does not amount to replacing a character string by a meaningless character string when a document is retrieved either, let alone "replacing, in the original document, a character string which is contained in the non-disclosure dictionary and not contained in the compulsory disclosure dictionary, with a meaningless character string by using the tag of non-disclosure," as recited in claim 1. Thus, even of Redlich, Bray, and Thompson were combined as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result.

The Office Action, in any case, asserts in section 9, at page 5, that:

Therefore, it would be obvious at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that by parsing (retrieving) XML documents along with the DTD and or Schema and changing the appearance of particular data is a standard feature when using and retrieving XML documents; and any results are not unpredictable.

Here, again, even if it were obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that by parsing (retrieving) XML documents along with the DTD and or Schema and changing the appearance of particular data is a standard feature when using and retrieving XML documents, that would still not amount to replacing a character string by a meaningless character string when a document is retrieved either, let alone "replacing, in the original document, a character string which is contained in the non-disclosure dictionary and not contained in the compulsory disclosure dictionary, with a meaningless character string by using the tag of non-disclosure," as recited in claim 1. Thus, even if Redlich were modified as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 1 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 3:

The fifth clause of claim 3 recites:

Embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document.

Neither Redlich, Bray, nor Thompson teach, disclose, or suggest "embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in

said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The seventh clause of claim 3 recites:

Replacing, in the original document, a character string which is contained in the non-disclosure dictionary and not contained in the compulsory disclosure dictionary, with a meaningless character string by using the tag of non-disclosure.

Neither Redlich, Bray, nor Thompson teach, disclose, or suggest “replacing, in the original document, a character string which is contained in the non-disclosure dictionary and not contained in the compulsory disclosure dictionary, with a meaningless character string by using the tag of non-disclosure,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Redlich, Bray, and Thompson were combined as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 3 is thus submitted to be allowable for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 5:

The fourth clause of claim 5 recites:

Embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document.

Neither Redlich, Bray, nor Thompson teach, disclose, or suggest “embedding a tag and the reason of non-disclosure corresponding to the retrieved character string which registered in said non-disclosure dictionary in said XML formatted document,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The sixth clause of claim 5 recites:

Replacing, in the original document, a character string which is contained in the non-disclosure dictionary and not contained in the compulsory disclosure dictionary, with a meaningless character string by using the tag of non-disclosure.

Neither Redlich, Bray, nor Thompson teach, disclose, or suggest “replacing, in the original document, a character string which is contained in the non-disclosure dictionary and not contained in the compulsory disclosure dictionary, with a meaningless character string by using the tag of non-disclosure,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus,

Application Serial No. 10/749,377
Amendment filed July 11, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed February 11, 2008

even of Redlich, Bray, and Thompson were combined as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 5 is thus submitted to be allowable for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 7:

Claim 7 recites:

Replacing the character string of non-disclosure with a meaningless character string according to said reason, when there is said character string of non-disclosure in said dictionary.

Neither Redlich, Bray, nor Thompson teach, disclose, or suggest “replacing the character string of non-disclosure with a meaningless character string according to said reason, when there is said character string of non-disclosure in said dictionary,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even of Redlich, Bray, and Thompson were combined as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 7 is thus submitted to be allowable for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of claims 1, 3, 5, and 7, as well as this entire application, is earnestly solicited. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Application Serial No. 10/749,377
Amendment filed July 11, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed February 11, 2008

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 11, 2008

By: /Thomas E. McKiernan/
Thomas E. McKiernan
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501